

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISS NOVER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/574,057	03/29/2006	Jean-Luc Veron	12928/10029	7991	
23280 Davidson Dav	7590 04/19/2011 ridson & Kappel, LLC	EXAMINER			
485 7th Avenu		MONDT, JOHANNES P			
14th Floor New York, N	7 10018		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3663		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/19/2011	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/574,057	VERON, JEAN-LUC				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	JOHANNES P. MONDT	3663				

	JOHANNES P. MONDT	3663						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 11 April 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
 All The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one or the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on; (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.								
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (uter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(I Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee					
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is actualised from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) flied after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ∑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 								
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1)								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Dewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the 								
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	will not be entered, or b) \(\Pi \) will	be entered and an e	xplanation of					
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 23-25 and 30-34. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	I and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>		condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
April 13, 2011.	/JOHANNES P MONDT Primary Examiner, Art U							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Proposed Amendment substantially amended claims 29-25, 30, 31 and 34 which would require further consideration and / or search The previously risaked issue of new matter for claim 23 is claim-specific and remains. The proposed amendment cannot be deemed to place the application in better condition for appeal because those claims proposed to be amended have not even been examined. J.M.J.c.

a/s: annotated front page of Proposed After-Final Amendment.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: For arguments on 35 USC 112, first and second paragraph, see item 3 under NOTE. Concerning applicant's traveste of the rejection under 103(a), viz. pp. 8-10, argument in bold on page 9 is not persuasive, because what needs to be learned from Benecek is the moving of the single fuel rods in capsule 7 within quiver (identified as the "loading structure") 40. Figure 9 and the referred-to discussion thereof in col. 6, 1, 42+ of Beneck teaches the moving of the individual fuel rods within the loading structure or quiver (finer 46, which is shown in Figure 9). With regards traversed rejection of claim 34 applicant appears to overinterpret gas filling location as laterally displaced from the loading location (see Figure 4 in Kraus and discussion thereof as cited.), J.M.J..